

REMARKS

Claims 28 and 31 have been amended. Claims 7-8, 15-16 and 23-24 have been cancelled.

The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 28-33 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has argued that applicants' claims 28 and 31 lack sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "said storage device." Applicants have amended applicants' claims 28 and 31 to delete the limitation objected to by the Examiner and to recite in its place "said storing step." Applicants submit that there is sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "said storing step" in applicants' claims 28 and 31 and, therefore, that applicants' claims 28 and 31, and their respective dependent claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim applicants' invention in compliance with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 7-8, 15-16 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by the Ono (US 6,133,941) patent. Applicants have cancelled applicants' claims 7-8, 15-16 and 23-24, thereby obviating the Examiner's rejection.


The Examiner has allowed applicants' claims 1-4, 5-6, 9-12, 13-14, 17-20, 21-22 and 25-27. The Examiner has also stated that applicants' claims 28-33 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. As above-indicated, claims 28-33 have been so amended.

In view of the above, it is submitted that all claims in the application, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims and passage of same and this application to issue is respectfully requested.

Dated: August 17, 2004

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P.C.  
1133 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
T (212) 790-9273

Respectfully submitted,

  
John J. Torrente  
Reg. No. 26,359  
Attorney of Record